United States Court of Appeals FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

| | No. 05-4096 |
|---------------------------|--|
| United States of America, | * |
| Appellee, v. | * Appeal from the United States * District Court for the * District of Nebraska. |
| Salome Gee Perez, | * [UNPUBLISHED] * |
| Appellant. | * |
| | Submitted: October 9, 2006 Filed: October 23, 2006 |

Before SMITH, MAGILL, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Salome Gee Perez appeals the 100-month prison sentence the district court¹ imposed after he pleaded guilty to conspiring to distribute and possess with intent to distribute cocaine base, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846. His counsel has filed a brief under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), suggesting that the sentence is unreasonable.

Appellate Case: 05-4096 Page: 1 Date Filed: 10/23/2006 Entry ID: 2102019

¹The Honorable Richard G. Kopf, United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

We disagree. In sentencing Perez within the undisputed Guidelines range, the district court properly considered the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors, specifically noting Perez's mental health needs; and nothing in the record rebuts the presumption that the sentence is reasonable. See *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220, 260-64 (2005) (appellate courts must review sentences for unreasonableness; sentencing courts must take into account Guidelines and other § 3553(a) factors); *United States v. Tobacco*, 428 F.3d 1148, 1151 (8th Cir. 2005) (presumptively reasonable sentence can be unreasonable if district court failed to consider relevant factor that should have received significant weight, gave significant weight to improper or irrelevant factor, or considered only appropriate factors but committed clear error of judgment in weighing them); *United States v. Lincoln*, 413 F.3d 716, 717-18 (8th Cir.) (sentence within applicable Guidelines range is presumptively reasonable, and defendant bears burden to rebut that presumption), *cert. denied*, 126 S. Ct. 840 (2005).

Having reviewed the record under *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80 (1988), we find no nonfrivolous issues. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment.
